

**PRODUCT:** 1 drum containing 59,800 *sodium salicylate tablets* at Philadelphia, Pa. Analysis showed that the product contained not more than 93.5 percent of the labeled amount of sodium salicylate.

**LABEL, IN PART:** (Drum) "Morse \* \* \* Sodium Salicylate 5 Grains N. F."

**NATURE OF CHARGE:** Adulteration, Section 501 (b), the article purported to be and was represented as "Sodium Salicylate Tablets," a drug the name of which is recognized in the United States Pharmacopeia, an official compendium, and its strength differed from the official standard. The standard provides that *sodium salicylate tablets* contain not less than 95 percent of the labeled amount of sodium salicylate, whereas the article contained less than 95 percent of sodium salicylate.

Misbranding, Section 502 (a), the label designation "N. F." was false and misleading as applied to a product which was not official in the National Formulary.

**DISPOSITION:** May 24, 1951. Default decree of condemnation and destruction.

**3494. Adulteration and misbranding of prophylactics. U. S. v. 998 Gross**  
\* \* \*. (F. D. C. No. 31022. Sample No. 10337-L.)

**LIBEL FILED:** April 24, 1951, Eastern District of Michigan.

**ALLEGED SHIPMENT:** On or about March 7 and 29, 1951, by Central Sundries, Inc., from New York, N. Y.

**PRODUCT:** 998 gross of *prophylactics* at Pontiac, Mich. Examination of samples showed that 4.8 percent were defective in that they contained holes.

**LABEL, IN PART:** "Royal Knight Prophylactics."

**NATURE OF CHARGE:** Adulteration, Section 501 (c), the quality of the article fell below that which it purported and was represented to possess.

Misbranding, Section 502 (a), the label designation "Prophylactics" was false and misleading as applied to the article, because of the fact that it contained holes.

**DISPOSITION:** June 12, 1951. Default decree of condemnation and destruction.

### **DRUGS AND DEVICES ACTIONABLE BECAUSE OF FALSE AND MISLEADING CLAIMS**

#### **DRUGS FOR HUMAN USE\***

**3495. Misbranding of Bulgarian yogurt culture. U. S. v. 3 Cases \* \* \***  
(F. D. C. No. 30943. Sample No. 12887-L.)

**LIBEL FILED:** May 3, 1951, District of Colorado.

**ALLEGED SHIPMENT:** The drug was shipped on or about January 12, 1951, and a number of pamphlets on or about March 5, 1951, by the International Yogurt Co., from Los Angeles, Calif.

**PRODUCT:** 3 cases, each containing 12 1-ounce bottles, of *Bulgarian yogurt culture* at Denver, Colo., together with a number of accompanying pamphlets entitled "Yogurt." Examination of samples from other shipments of the product indicated that it was a culture of *Lactobacilli*.

\*See also Nos. 3481, 3488, 3490-3493.

**NATURE OF CHARGE:** Misbranding, Section 502 (a), certain statements in the accompanying pamphlets were false and misleading. The statements represented and suggested that the article was effective to enable one to maintain or regain health; to improve vitality; to help in the digestion of other foods; to promote intestinal hygiene; to extend for years the period of one's usefulness; to prevent typhoid, paratyphoid, diphtheria, and numerous types of dysentery; and to synthetize the B vitamins; that it was effective as a dietary treatment of numerous digestive disorders, such as stomach and duodenal ulcers, flatulence, colitis, constipation, diarrhea and dysentery in infants, children, and adults; that it was effective to destroy pathogenic organisms; to improve health and prolong life, and to enable elderly persons to retain their vigor, mental alertness, attractiveness, appearance or glow of health, and other characteristics of youth; that it was effective to prevent illness, deafness, faulty eyesight, and any number of earmarks of physical degeneration in elderly people; and that it was effective in the treatment of mucous colitis and to insure a fine complexion. The article was not effective for the purposes represented.

**DISPOSITION:** June 18, 1951. The International Yogurt Co. having executed an acceptance of service and authorization for taking of final decree, judgment of condemnation was entered and the court ordered that the product be delivered to a charitable institution.

**3496. Misbranding of Leal liniment. U. S. v. 16 Bottles, etc. (F. D. C. No. 30981. Sample No. 15087-L.)**

**LIBEL FILED:** June 1, 1951, Southern District of Iowa.

**ALLEGED SHIPMENT:** On or about May 4, 1951, by the Leaf Oil Laboratories, from Sutton, Nebr.

**PRODUCT:** 16 3-ounce bottles and 12 6-ounce bottles of *Leal liniment* at Council Bluffs, Iowa. Analysis showed that the product consisted essentially of alcohol, water, and essential oils such as turpentine, cassia, and cloves.

**LABEL, IN PART:** "Leal Liniment 83% Alcohol."

**NATURE OF CHARGE:** Misbranding, Section 502 (a), certain statements in the labeling of the article, namely, in a circular entitled "Leal Liniment," which was attached to each bottle with a rubber band, were false and misleading. The statements represented and suggested that the article was an adequate and effective treatment for bumps, bruises, sprained ankle or side, crushed muscles, pain caused by weather changes, headache, head colds, stiff neck, sore and tender lips, frosted hands, sinusitis, rheumatism, arthritis, varicose veins, hemorrhoids or piles, corns, bunions, and conditions where irritation, inflammation, fever, or congestion exist; that the article would penetrate deeply and prevent existence of poison germs and irritating substances; and that it was the nearest approach to a cure-all. The article was not an adequate and effective treatment for the conditions represented; it would not penetrate deeply and prevent existence of poison germs and irritating substances; and it was not the nearest approach to a cure-all.

**DISPOSITION:** June 29, 1951. Default decree of condemnation and destruction.